

For instance you say, "Can anyone be so naive as to think that the CIA would not employ such subterfuge so long as it does not risk full exposure?" I assure you that there is no way in which I am going to say we are doing one thing and proceed to do another. Beyond that, any action we take today is subject to full scrutiny of an Intelligence Oversight Board appointed by the President and two Select Committees of the Congress. Thus it is quite incorrect to surmise that were we to violate our own rule about newsmen we would not be risking full exposure. We indeed would.

rdi-

viet

ised.

nce. oned

ioli-:

firs!

h to

vith. fied:

rit-

can-

s in-

self

um and:

um

18-

uld uch:

for.

ow.

You indicate that the regulations I published last December are not credible because they don't forbid a relationship with free-lance journalists. May I invite your attention to the fact that I published an article in Foreign Affairs in January of 1977, and I'm presently drafting some other material to be published in like journals. If you would extend the definition, as I gather you prefer, I could not continue to hold my present assignment. I really don't think there is much connection between my past article on "Naval Balance" or a forthcoming article on the problems of maintaining secrecy in a democratic society that could be injurious to the American public just because I also happen to work for the CIA.

You oppose our using foreign journalists. I'm not sure that you really feel it important to preserve the editorial integrity of the